DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 367 UD 007 879

College Bound Program, New York City. Secondary Program in Compensatory Education 4.
American Inst. for Research in Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Report No-OE-37032
Pub Date 69
Note-13p.
Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402 ($0.20)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-Academic Achievement, *College High School Cooperation, *College Preparation, Cultural Enrichment, *Disadvantaged Youth, *High School Students, Program Costs; Program Evaluation, Remedial Instruction, School Personnel, Small Classes, Summer Schools, Test Results, *Underachievers
Identifiers-*College Bound Program, New York City, Stanford Achievement Test

From 2,000 to 3,000 ninth- and tenth-grade students in New York City, mostly black and Puerto Rican, were selected for an intensive educational program (small classes, double sessions of English, group and individual counseling, and cultural enrichment) with the hope that they would remain in the program throughout high school and then pursue higher education. Local colleges and universities had agreed to admit successful program graduates and provide them with financial aid. The students, selected for their good attendance and conduct, were unlikely to enter a college preparatory program in high school. About one-half were between grade level and two years retarded in reading and arithmetic. Over the 1967 6-week summer session which preceded the program during the school year students showed an average gain of 3 months to a year in four tests of reading and arithmetic. The evaluation of this session is the only one reported. A description of the program contains information on staff, methodology, and costs. (EF)

ED027367

OE 37032
OE/BESE TITLE I

COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
New York City

07879E

IT WORKS

IT WORKS

IT WORKS

IT WORKS

IT WORKS

UD 007 879

Secondary Program in Compensatory Education 4

1. Preschool Program in Compensatory Education

Preschool Program, Fresno, California OE–37034
Infant Education Research Project, Washington, D.C. OE–37033
Early Childhood Project, New York City OE–37027
Perry Preschool Project, Ypsilanti, Michigan OE–37035
Diagnostically Based Curriculum, Bloomington, Indiana OE–37024
Academic Preschool, Champaign, Illinois OE–37041

2. Elementary Program in Compensatory Education

More Effective Schools, New York City OE–37042
Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, Hartford, Connecticut OE–37038
After School Study Centers, New York City OE–37036
Self-Directive Dramatization Project, Joliet, Illinois OE–37037
Project Concern, Hartford, Connecticut OE–37030
Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE–37031
School and Home Program, Flint, Michigan OE–37023
Programmed Tutorial Reading Project, Indianapolis, Indiana OE–37029
Speech and Language Development Program, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE–37028

3. Elementary-Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

Homework Helper Program, New York City OE–37025
Communication Skills Center Project, Detroit, Michigan OE–37039

4. Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

Junior High Summer Institutes, New York City OE–37026
Project R–3, San Jose, California OE–37040
College Bound Program, New York City OE–37032

For information on any of the booklets listed, please write to Information Officer, Division of Compensatory Education U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

IT WORKS

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM
NEW YORK CITY

One of a Series of

Successful Compensatory Education Programs

UD 007 879

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Robert H. Finch, Secretary

Office of Education
Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Commissioner

FOREWORD

This project report is part of an independent study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children completed by the American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif., under contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

The researchers report this project significantly improved the educational attainment of the disadvantaged children involved. Other communities, in reviewing the educational needs of the disadvantaged youngsters they serve, may wish to use this project as a model - adapting it to their specific requirements and resources.

Division of Compensatory Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

THE COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM

OF NEW YORK CITY

Introduction

Ninth- and tenth-graders were selected for an intensive education program with the hope that they will remain in the program throughout high school and then pursue higher education. A consortium of local colleges and universities has agreed to admit successful program graduates and provide them financial aid.

The students were from poverty areas; approximately 50% were Negro and 30% Puerto Rican. They were selected on the bases of having good attendance and conduct, but being likely to enter a general (non-college preparatory) high school program. About one-half were between grade level and two years retarded in arithmetic and reading; about one-quarter were above this standard and one-quarter below.

The program began with the summer session of 1967, attended by 2000 students at 8 centers. In the following school year there were 3000 students in 24 high schools (200 in each of 6 schools, 100 in each of 18). It is anticipated that when the first wave of students are seniors, there will be 10,000 enrollees at one time in grades 9-12.

Over a 6-week period of the summer session, average gains of 3 months to a year were indicated on 4 tests of reading and arithmetic. The evaluation is confined to this session.

Personnel

A. Director. (Full-time. He was formerly principal of a school involved with a similar program.)

He was in charge of policy, budget, and general administration of the program.

B. Assistant Director. (Full-time. She was formerly a teacher, general counselor, and college counselor in inner-city schools.)

She had general administrative duties involving daily contact with the program personnel in the schools and day-to-day implementation of the program.

C. Coordinators. (One per school. Part-time: coordinators taught one or two classes in addition to their administrative duties for the program. These were classroom teachers, selected by the building principals.)

Each coordinator administered the program in one school during the school year. They met regularly with other coordinators to exchange ideas and experiences.

D. Teachers-in-Charge. (One per summer center; 4 1/2 hours per day for the summer session. These people had supervisory licenses and were usually department chairmen in the high school serving as a summer center.)

Each teacher-in-charge administered the program in one of the 8 summer centers.

E. Assistant Teachers-in-Charge. (One per summer center; 4 1/2 hours per day for the summer session. Often, these persons were coordinators or counselors in the school year program.)

F. Summer-Session Supervisors. (4 in number, 4 1/2 hours per day. They were chairmen of high school English (2) or mathematics (2) departments.)

These supervisors developed the curriculum and supervised teaching. (During the school year these functions were performed by the department chairmen of each school as a part of their normal duty.)

G. Teachers. (Summer: approximately 60 English and 60 math teachers at 4 1/2 hours per day. School year: each school was allocated funds for the equivalent of five extra full-time teachers per 100 program students. Larger number of teachers were actually involved, since each taught some program classes and some regular classes.)

They taught small classes of 20 students or fewer. English and mathematics teachers participated in the summer session. In the school year English, mathematics, science, social science, and foreign languages were taught.

H. Guidance Counselors. (One per 100 program students. Full-time: counselors had no non-program counselees. In addition

to the academic-year counseling, the counselors worked in the 1967 summer session, but were deleted from the 1968 summer session.)

They counseled the same program students throughout high school, in cooperation with the family assistants. The counselors provided individual counseling as well as conducted weekly or bi-weekly small-group guidance sessions, and they provided information on college admission and worked with the cooperating college group to plan suitable college placement.

I. Summer-Session Librarians. (One at each of the 8 centers, approximately 4 1/2 hours per day.)

The librarians maintained normal library services and instructed students in techniques of library use.

J. Family Assistants. (One for every 50-70 students in the program. Four hours per day in summer, six hours per day in school year. Paraprofessional; community residents; their ethnic background was similar to students served.)

They acted as liaison between home and school and explained the program to parents. They assisted students and their families in obtaining necessary medical and social services.

K. Teaching Aides. (200 in summer of 1967, 140 in summer of 1968; 4 1/2 hours per day; college students.)

They assisted in the program classes, one or two aides per classroom. They took care of routine duties and provided individual tutoring.

L. Secretaries. (One in each summer center and in each participating school during the school year; two in central office of program. Full-time.)

The above personnel are those associated directly with the instructional program of the city school system. In addition, the consortium of colleges and universities maintains a small staff concerned with college admission and with financial aid for those admitted.

Methodology: General

The program stressed: 1) small classes averaging 15 to 18

students, 2) double sessions of English, 3) special group and individual counseling, 4) a cultural enrichment program of field trips. Students were told at the outset, and frequently reminded, that they were expected to work toward college admission. To make this a tangible and realistic goal, th cooperating colleges and universities (now numbering 100) have committed themselves to admission and financial aid for a specific number of program students - generally five per one thousand undergraduates admitted.

In the school year program, students carried seven or eight classes daily. Usually, six of these were program classes of small size: two English and one each of mathematics, science, social science, and foreign language. An additional one or two periods were given over to subjects such as art, music, or health, in larger classes together with non-program students.

An effort was made to capitalize on reduced class size, through tailoring assignments to the perceived abilities of the individual students, and through an informal class discussion approach in which the teacher was less of a central figure than is usual in larger classes. There was a similar effort to utilize the double English period by such techniques as having students write a paper, receive teacher comments, and rewrite the paper, all in the same day.

Pupils were grouped homogeneously in each subject, with maximum flexibility for individual students to change classes as their progress seemed too slow or fast for the classes in which they were placed. It is anticipated that some students will drop from or enter the program in the upper years, and that some students may elect the option of taking five years to complete the program satisfactorally. Students will be expected to obtain an academic diploma and pass the Regents' exam: the program is aimed at raising achievement, not at lowering standards.

Each school planned its own cultural enrichment program. Trips included museums, planetaria, libraries, the Shakespeare Festival in Connecticut, and the colonial village of Sturbridge, Massachusetts, among others. Concerts, ballet, theatre, quality films, and lectures on African and Hispanic culture were also on the agenda. Such events were preceded with briefings and discussions; many were scheduled for weekends and evenings to minimize interference with school work.

The program of the summer session was similar to that of the school year, except that classes were held for only 3 hours per

day, and only in mathematics and English. Many students remained a fourth hour for counseling, individual assistance, or use of the library. The programs of cultural enrichment, counseling, and family assistance were pursued just as in the school year.

The summer school was meant principally for incoming ninth-graders, to ease their transition into high school. Their summer-school teachers were from the school in which they would enroll the following school year. It is anticipated that some older students will attend summer school also, as the program progresses. Attendance is voluntary; in the first summer about two-thirds of the program participants enrolled (many others had prior commitments to jobs or other plans). For those enrolled, daily attendance levels were over 80%.

The activities of the family assistant were supplemented by parents' days and "graduation" exercises held at the schools, with parents in attendance.

Representatives of the college consortium helped arrange for tutoring by college students, arranged campus tours and speakers, and began to evaluate student records in preparation for ultimate college placement.

Evaluation

A. Measures of Achievement

At the time of writing, results were available only for the initial summer session, 1967. Students were tested with alternate forms of the Stanford Achievement Test at the beginning and at the end of the summer session. Results for the four subtests administered are summarized in Table 1. It can be seen that group mean gains of from 3 months to a school year were achieved in the 6 weeks of instruction. The gain on each of the four subtests was determined to be highly significant (.001).

B. Other Evaluation Indices

Teachers gave high ratings of student behavior, both academic and non-academic, and of student and parent attitudes. The ratings of the family assistants, though generally positive, indicated a perceived need for greater understanding of family and neighborhood problems, by school personnel. The report of the program director noted the conscientiousness and healthy self-esteem of the participating students.

Table 1

GRADE-EQUIVALENT SCORES ON THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST
1967 SUMMER SESSION
COLLEGE BOUND PROGRAM

Subtest	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Gain
Paragraph Meaning	1352	7.7	8.0	.3
Arithmetic Computation	1364	7.4	8.4	1.0
Applications	1364	7.9	8.3	.4
Concepts	1364	7.6	8.3	.7

C. Modifications and Suggestions

Some project personnel feel, after one year's experience with the program, that: (1) students more than 2 years retarded should not be selected for the program, (2) teachers should be trained to capitalize on the smaller classes with appropriate instructional techniques.

Counselors participated in the 1967 summer program but not in the 1968 summer program. Originally, it was hoped that they would have an opportunity to become acquainted with their counselees and that this would ease the transition to high school during the following year. But for one reason or another, most counselors were not able to have the same group of 100 counselees during the next school year. This in part was the reason for deletion of counselors from the 1968 summer program.

Budget

1	Director	Full-time
1	Assistant Director	Full-time
1/school (total 24)	Coordinators	About 2/3 time in school year

1/summer center (total 8)	Teachers-in-Charge	4 1/2 hrs./day for summer session
1/summer center (total 8)	Assistant Teachers-in-Charge	4 1/2 hrs./day for summer session
4	Summer Session Supervisors	4 1/2 hrs./day for summer session
5/school	Teachers (school year)	Full-time equivalent
120-130	Teachers (summer)	4 1/2 hours/day
1/100 students	Guidance Counselors	Full-time in school year
1/summer center (total 8)	Librarians	4 1/2 hrs./day for summer session
1/50-70 students	Family Assistants	Summer: 4 hrs./day Schl Yr.: 6 hrs./day
200 in 1967 140 in 1968	Teaching Aides	4 1/2 hrs./day for summer session
1/center	Secretaries (summer)	Full-time
1/school	Secretaries (school year)	Full-time
2	Secretaries (central office)	Full-time

Non-Personnel Costs for School Year (e.g., materials, culteral activities, travel of family assistants)	$36/student
For Summer Session:	
Materials	$ 9/student
Cultural activities plus miscellaneous office supplies, carfare for students, travel of family assistants, etc.	$ 3/student

For the first full year of operation (including summer session) the program was budgeted for $3,250,00 beyond normal allocation. It is hoped that a budget of $8,000,000 for each class over 4 years will produce 2000 college-candidate graduates per year. This is the cost to the city school system; the work of the cooperating colleges is separately financed.

Quoted Sources

* Horowitz, G. R., Lovinger, R., and Forlano, G. An evaluation of the College Bound Program, summer 1967. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1967.

Other Sources Not Quoted

Edelstein, E. The work of the family assistants in the College Bound Program. Brooklyn, New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, College Bound Program, February, 1968.

Hillson, H. T. Report on the summer session of the College Bound Program: July-August 1967. Brooklyn, New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, College Bound Program. (Undated.)

Smith, E, and Schlakman, S. Teaching English in the College Bound Program (Parts I, II, and III). Brooklyn, New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, College Bound Program. (Undated.)

For More Information

Henry T. Hillson, Director, or
Miss Eleanor Edelstein, Assistant Director
College Bound Program
Board of Education
141 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

---

* The Office of Education is collecting this material for placement in the ERIC system. Items may be obtained either in microfiche or hard copy.

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE / OFFICE OF EDUCATION / OE–37032

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1969 344-842 (2051)